

## REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4 - 22 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (U.S. Pat. No. '856). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 2 is cancelled. Therefore, this rejection is moot.

Claims 1 and 4-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higuchi et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,323,930) in view of Kim et al ('856). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 13, 19, and 20 have been amended to call for the overcoat layer to be provided with the first substrate and continuously formed from the area where the first and second substrates oppose to the protruding portion. This amendment is supported on page 12, lines 21-23 of the application and, for example, in Figures 2 and 3. Neither Higuchi, Kim, nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests such a feature. As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 13, 19, and 20 are not obvious.

Further, per independent claims 1, 13, and 19-22, the Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to modify the teachings of Higuchi with the teachings of Kim to arrive at the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully asserts, however, that Higuchi contains no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to modify its teachings with those of Kim

to arrive at the claimed invention. That is, the claimed invention is directed to a liquid crystal display that contains an overcoat layer to protect its electrodes from water that may seep through a resinous sealing material. Such a sealing material that is often used is, for example, silicone (see p. 3, line 11 of the application). By disposing an overcoat layer over the electrodes, the electrodes are protected from any moisture that may penetrate the silicone sealing material.

Similarly to the present invention, Higuchi teaches an insulating resin such as polyimide resin, epoxy resin or silicone resin which forms a protective film 32 (see column 8, lines 20-22 of Higuchi, emphasis added). Higuchi, however, does not teach that the use of such a resin is susceptible to moisture. In fact, Higuchi is completely silent with respect to a moisture problem that may affect the electrodes. Moreover, by teaching the deposition of an insulating resin such as silicone directly over the electrodes as shown in Figure 9(h), Higuchi teaches a configuration that the claimed invention intends to avoid. As such, in addition to there being no teaching, suggestion, or motivation contained in Higuchi that would lead one skilled in the art to look to Kim to dispose an overcoat layer over the electrodes to protect from water, Higuchi teaches directly away from the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully asserts, therefore, that since Higuchi does not suggest the desirability to modify its teachings with those of Kim, it would not have been obvious.

With respect to claims 21, Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Higuchi, Kim, nor any combination thereof teaches, suggests, or provides motivation to utilize an overcoat layer of a sol gel reacted inorganic substance covering the third electrodes.

As such, an overcoat layer of a sol gel reacted inorganic substance would not have been obvious.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 3, 2003  
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

By: G. Gregory Schiely  
G. Gregory Schiely, Reg. No. 27,382  
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,844

GGS/BEW/JAH